

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,838	01/26/2004	Dennis L. Hammond	APX-12571.001	6895
7609 75	590 08/23/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER
RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK, LLP			MAI, NGOCLAN THI	
	CLID AVENUE, SUITE 700 LAND, OH 44115-1405		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·	,		1742	
			DATE MAILED: 08/23/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary						
		10/764,838 Examiner	HAMMOND, DENNIS L.			
	,					
The MAILING DATE of this communication		Ngoclan T. Mai	correspondence address			
Period for Reply	ATE OF BIIO COMMUNICACION APP					
THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be a after SIX (6) MONTHS from - If the period for reply specific - If NO period for reply is spec - Failure to reply within the set	OF THIS COMMUNICATION. vailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 the mailing date of this communication. It above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply iffed above, the maximum statutory period vor extended period for reply will, by statute fice later than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDON and a date of this communication, even if timely file	imely filed ays will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•		•			
1) Responsive to c	ommunication(s) filed on <u>06 Ju</u>	ıne 2006.				
· ·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims		•				
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1,3,5-1</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s)	4,16-20, 22 and 23 is/are rejec	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification	is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) f	0) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
, ,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
'	• ','	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ol aminer. Note the attached Office				
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119	•				
a) All b) Son 1. Certified c 2. Certified c 3. Copies of applicatio	ne * c) None of: copies of the priority documents copies of the priority documents the certified copies of the prior n from the International Bureau	s have been received in Applicative documents have been receive	tion No ved in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cite Danie of Draftsperson's F 	d (PTO-892) Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D				
	atement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Patent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-14, 16-20 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1, 3, 5-14, 16-20, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofalvi et al (US 2003/0220424 or U.S. Patent No. 6,376,585) in view of Donch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,851,189).

Schofalvi discloses a powder metallurgy composition comprising metal powder, a binder composition which comprises an aliphatic polyester polymer, an ethylenebisamide wax, and a guanidine wetting agent and a debinding accelerator, (2003/02204424 para. [0012], [0124]-[0125] or U.S. Patent No. 6,376,585, abstract). Schofalvi also teaches the powder metallurgy composition can be formed into green composition by injection molding or compacting and sintering.

The difference between the claims and Schofalvi is that Schofalvi does not teach graphite powder. However it is known in the art to add graphite powder as an alloying agent to metal powder to provide strength to the product produced from these powders, see Donch et al, col. 2, line 23-34. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include graphite powder in powder metal composition taught by Schofalvi to provide improvement in strength of the final product.

Although Schofalvi does not specifically teach at least a portion of said solid lubricant converting to a liquid phase upon application of pressure to said composition, however, since the binder composition taught by Schofalvi contains the same ingredients as taught, at least a portion of the binder composition is inherently converted to a liquid phase upon application of pressure as recited in claim 1 or is capable of

forming liquid phase upon application of pressure as recited in claim 13. "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established, In re Best, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not.' In re Spada, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, the prima facie case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product. In re Best, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977)."

Regarding claim 3, Schofalvi teaches employing binder composition in an amount of 1 to 10 vol. %, 2003/0220424 [0122] and U.S. Patent No. '585, col. 16, lines 39-57. Although the reference teaches the amount of the binder phrase in volume percent, it is the examiners position that, when converted to weight percent, this amount inherently encompasses the claimed amount absent evidence to the contrary.

Regarding claims 5 and 9, the limitations recited in the claims are disclosed in 2003/0220424 paragraphs [0040] and [0131] and U.S. Patent No. `585, col. 8, lines 52+.

Regarding claim 7, the limitation is discloses in 2003/0220424 [0078] or U.S. Patent No. '585, col. 11, lines 29+. Note that ACRAWAX ®C is a synthetic wax.

As for claim 8, the ethylenebisamide wax taught by the references read on the claimed amide wax.

As for claims 10-12, the limitation is disclosed in 2003/0220424 paragraphs [0041]- [0043] or U.S. Patent No. '585 col. 8, lines 52+.

Regarding claims 14 and 16, since the binder composition and the graphite powder taught by Schofalvi in view of Donch et al. are the same as the claims, the properties as recited in the instant claims would have inherently possessed by the teachings of the cited references. Therefore, the burden is on the applicant to prove that the product of the prior art does not necessarily or inherently possess

Application/Control Number: 10/764,838 Page 4

Art Unit: 1742

characteristics attributed to the claimed product. <u>In re Spada</u>, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990), <u>In re Best</u>, 195 USPQ 430 and MPEP § 2112.01.

As for claims 18-20, since Schofalvi teaches the same method employing the same material as claimed, the action or the properties of the polar powder disclosed in the claims as a resulted of the process would inherently be possessed by the teachings of the cited reference.

Regarding claim 22, Schofalvi discloses the amount of binder composition is from 1 vol.% to 10 vol.%, para [0122]. Although Schofalvi discloses the amount of the binder composition in vol. percent, it is the examiners position that, when converted to weight percent, this amount inherently encompasses the claimed amount absent evidence to the contrary.

As for claim 23, Schofalvi teaches the claimed method where metal powder and binder are place in a mold and press, col. 35, lines 11+. There is no teaching of employing heat during pressing. Thus the application of pressure is at ambient temperature which reads on the limitation temperature of no greater than 140 F.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoclan T. Mai whose telephone number is (571) 272-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NGOCLAN MAI PRIMARY EXAMINER